



## Where is the Leadership?

By Ken Crane  
PLEA Secretary

I was sitting in my office the other day plowing through the pile of tasks and paperwork on my desk when I was paged to take a phone call. This particular call came from a 30+ year veteran of the department. He was upset about the lack of support for Phoenix Police Officers from within the management ranks of our own department as well as lack of support from city government with regard to the recent events surrounding the passage of SB-1070. The conversation as you can well imagine was laced with some pretty colorful language.

Frustration was expressed at the fact that officers on the street now had to put up with derogatory remarks from citizens. We all knew when we took this job that there would be times we would be called names, we also knew that this went with the territory. The difference according to this officer is that there have now been an increasing number of incidences where officers have been called racists without any provocation. The concern and frustration expressed by this veteran officer was understandable. It can be hard to don the uniform and soldier on every day when the perception is that your own leadership is failing to support you.

During our conversation he made several points:

- The Police Chief and Mayor (described in terms that can't be repeated here) had failed miserably in voicing their support and confidence in the troop's ability to carry out the mission in a tough environment.
- We have a "young" department and he worries that the mayor and chief's opposition to SB-1070 will do more to create division in the community and cultivate a sense of anxiety among the troops.
- As a 30 year veteran he is proud of the PPD, proud of his profession and has full confidence in his peer officers whom he described as being "intelligent and articulate" and plugged in to what is going on in the world around them.
- He along with many others is sick and tired of being told they need to be more "culturally aware". As he put it, "we are culturally aware".
- As a final point he expressed worry and concern for the younger troops out there having to perform an increasingly difficult job with less and less support from the top.

As I listened to the points being made, I had to agree with everything that was being said. There will always be controversial pieces of legislation that come down the pike, some more controversial than others. Law enforcement has always had a tough job, it's made even tougher when the leaders don't back the rank and file and through their public comment, express a lack of confidence in the line officers ability to get the job done.

It is hugely disappointing when leaders at the highest levels of government to include Attorney General Eric Holder, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano and State Department Spokesperson PJ Crowley have all come out vociferously opposing SB-1070, yet when asked the magic question "have you read the bill?", the answers resonate with the same common theme, I haven't read it, or read it yet, I've skimmed through it, I've been briefed on it. When AG Holder was asked who briefed him he replied that he'd been briefed on the bill by the media. One would logically assume that this is the same media that themselves haven't read the bill.

Even more disappointing are the elected government and law enforcement officials at the local level here in Arizona who also haven't read the bill. They fail to demonstrate leadership when they join in fanning the flames of controversy. They choose to engage in commentary and dialogue that encourages disruptive action rather than having a calming effect. They choose to engage in commentary that casts doubt and suspicion on the ability of line officers to do their jobs effectively rather than to reaffirm the professionalism and work ethic that has made the PPD a shining example on a national level.

***Even more disappointing are the elected government and law enforcement officials at the local level here in Arizona who also haven't read the bill.***

Mayor Gordon, in a time of extreme financial crisis, wanted to waste valuable city financial resources to mount a legal challenge against SB-1070. The City Council opposed such action which was ultimately backed up by a legal opinion from the City Attorney stating that the Mayor did not have the authority to act unilaterally in pursuing such an action on behalf of the city. This still didn't deter the mayor from making outrageous claims in the media with regard to constitutional issues, concerns over racial profiling, and publicly labeling other politicians as racists. The Mayor then felt it necessary to entertain and give an audience to any person or group that had a viewpoint opposing SB-1070. He was all too eager to

*Continued on page 2.*

# Where is the Leadership?

Continued from page 1.

meet with Latin pop singer Shakira along with well known minority activist Al Sharpton who, like a shark smelling blood in the water, seems to drift into the picture anytime there is hint of racial discord in the air. Both have something in common with the rest of the talking heads, they haven't read nor do they understand the bill, and why should they? Reading and understanding the facts might get in the way of a good emotional protest. All of the Mayors antics surrounding his angst over SB 1070 resulted in...you guessed it...a further drain on police resources when additional patrol officers had to be detailed to provide security at his private residence due in large part to controversy that he himself had stirred up.

Phoenix City Councilman Michael Nowakowski who ran for office on a platform of "Enforcing the Law" has been seen at media events pumping his fist in the air and yelling "Si Se Puede" (Yes We Can). Since the phrase "Si Se Puede" has become the rallying cry of the proponents of illegal immigration, one might be left with the impression that the Councilman supports illegal immigrants along with their illegal conduct that brought them into the country. Will Councilman Nowakowski change his election slogan to "Enforcing some of the Laws"? Nowakowski went on to make public comment in the media with regard to SB-1070. His comments gave listeners the impression that he hadn't read the bill and that if he had, he didn't understand the provisions in it.

Phoenix Police Chief, Jack Harris was recently quoted in the media with regard to SB-1070 when he said, "When you get a law that leads a state down this path, where the enforcement is targeted to a particular segment of the population, it's very difficult not to profile, it takes officers away from doing what our main core mission is, and that is to make our community safe."

After watching the antics of the Mayor and listening to the confidence inspiring comments from our Chief, I guess we should all pause and express our thanks for their strong vote of confidence in the men and women of the Phoenix PD to carry out their job duties in a professional and unbiased manner just like they've been doing for decades.

Here's what you would hope to hear in the media from the Chief of the 5th largest city in the nation.

## Reporter:

*Chief, now that the Governor has signed SB-1070 into law what is your take on it, what challenges do you anticipate in enforcing the law, do you think it's constitutionally valid, and do you think that law like this will spawn incidences of racial profiling?*

## Chief:

*Well, whether we personally agree or disagree with a certain piece of legislation is not the issue, our job in law enforcement is to enforce all laws to the best of our abilities and that is exactly what we plan to do when SB-1070 goes into effect. Any constitutional issue that may arise with regard to the enforcement of the law is something that would have to be ultimately determined by the courts. I don't foresee any huge challenge when this law goes into effect. As you may recall, our own departmental policy on immigration enforcement, Operations order 1.4 which we revised about a year and a half ago, closely parallels many of the provisions that are in SB-1070. With regard to racial profiling, I just don't see it. The Phoenix Police department has never had a history of civil rights violations, racial profiling, or biased policing. I don't think that one can jump to the conclusion that by merely signing a piece of legislation that you will automatically begin to see racial profiling incidents. The Phoenix Police department is comprised of some of the finest men and women in the country and we are without a doubt one of the most professional major city police departments in the nation. The men and women on our department comprise a police force that I am proud of and that the citizens of phoenix can also be proud of. I count it a privilege to serve as their Chief of Police and have every confidence that they will perform to the same high levels of excellence as they always have when this new law goes into effect.*

OK. Wake up. Fantasy's over. You won't hear a statement like this anytime soon coming from the fourth floor or city hall. The reason is that a statement like this comes from someone who is a leader rather than a politician.

Despite the obvious lack of leadership, one thing has become apparent when it comes to the line level officers and detectives that do the job on a daily basis. They are resilient and have proven time and again that they have what it takes to get the job done despite the lack of support from the top.

**Membership meetings are the  
last Tuesday of each month**

**at 7:30, 12:30, and 5:30.**

**Board meeting is held the 3rd Tuesday  
each month**

**and members can attend at  
8:30 am.**

## **DATES TO REMEMBER & BENEFITS TO MEMBERS**

Rep from Aflac will be in the PLEA Office the second Wednesday of each month. Call Aflac Office @ 602.870.1122

Hester, Heitel & Associates Exclusive group insurance offers to PLEA Members only for homeowners, and auto and liability.

Please call Mark or Loretta at 602.230.7726

Tom Jonovich Financial & Retirement Planning Sessions  
3rd Thursday each month at PLEA Office 10am - Noon

Rep from Nationwide will be in the PLEA Office the 4th Thursday of each month to assist with Deferred Comp, 401(a), or PEHP and updating your beneficiary. Call Kathleen Donovan @ 602.266.2733, x 1161.

# Maybe I'm Missing Something...

By Levi Bolton  
PLEA Lobbyist

"Have you actually read the bill?" A question I've asked of many of our media friends just prior to an interview regarding Arizona's new Immigration bill recently signed into law by the Governor. Nearly to a person the response is curiously the same, "Frankly, I haven't read it" or "I've only skimmed over it." I am not trying to villainize the media or play the blame game for the monumental misrepresentation of the language within the new law, but now the issue is no longer driven by the merits of the bill's content, but the debilitating effects of mankind's most powerful emotion...FEAR.

Hypocrisy in a blender is the anthem of Arizona's critics with Mexican authorities moving to the head of the line. While publicly condemning Arizona's new law, apparently Mexican leaders have overlooked their own tough Immigration Law - Article 67 which requires their law enforcement officers to determine the lawful presences of "foreigners" before engaging any matters. How about the vociferous dialogue spewing from the lips of some of our California neighbors crying for the boycott of Arizona as retaliation for the "racist" new legislation. Perhaps they have forgotten their own California Penal Code 834b. (a) - which reads in part..."Every law enforcement agency shall fully cooperate with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service regarding any person who is arrested if he or she is suspected of being present in the United States in violation of federal immigration laws". It goes on to say that law enforcement agencies must do the following: "Attempt to verify the legal status of such persons as a citizen of the United States, an alien unlawfully admitted as a permanent resident, an alien lawfully admitted for a temporary period of time or as an alien who is present in the United States in violation of immigration laws. The verification process may include, but shall not be limited to, questioning the person regarding his or her date and place of birth, and entry into the United States, and demanding documentation to indicate his or her legal status."

At some point, someone is going to actually read Arizona's new legislation and find that it virtually mirrors existing Federal immigration law and additionally takes steps that even the federal law fails to address. There is an affirmative declaration that race or ethnicity cannot be used as a basis for criminality and warns that racial profiling will not be tolerated in the enforcement of the law. The new law emphasizes the presumption of legal presence of all who are contacted by Arizona's peace officers and that the police must first have a lawful predicate stop coupled with the development of reasonable suspicion to believe a person is in the United States before the new law comes into play.

Now that fear and misinformation have taken over for sensibility and reason, Arizona's new law has taken on the nefarious reputation of being racist, ill crafted and misguided. As an Arizonan I am deeply offended. As a retired 32-year police veteran I am proud of the men and women who protect and serve and find it irresponsible and patently absurd that there is a reason to believe that the passage of a law in the great state of Arizona will cause its police officers to unilaterally lose their professionalism, abandon their responsibility to preserve the civil rights of all persons or respect for the rule of law.

But for those who haven't the time to examine the actual language in the bill, allow me to address some of the myths that have dominated the discussion of this new law which has also marketed some dangerous and unfortunate misconceptions. Myth - police will be sued if they don't abide by this law. Folks, anyone can be

sued. Law suits were common in law enforcement before this bill and that will not change as a result of this bill. There is an important distinction in SB1070 which provides for indemnification for police officers who run afoul of this legislation. That indemnification is conditional and would not protect an officer who intentionally violates a person's civil rights or protect an officer who chooses to engage in unlawful behavior.

Fact - a police agency or political subdivision which promulgates rules or policies that prevent their officers from accessing their federal immigration partners or to use their law enforcement discretion to enforce immigration laws to the extent of their lawful authority can be sued. It's the agency that can be sued not the officer. Solution - don't have these policies and no one gets sued. Myth - police officers will profile people of color walking down the street and demand proof of citizenship. This is absolutely false. Enforcement of this legislation as well as in any law enforcement contact requires a predicate offense. Illegal immigration is not a race, it is conduct. The legal authority for a police contact is constitutional and has been around for a very long time. There are three circumstances that would enable a police officer to stop and contact a citizen. The first is consent. A person can refuse to submit to this contact and the officer has no legal authority to overcome a person's wish to walk away. The second is reasonable suspicion and the third is probable cause. Reasonable suspicion and probable cause require compliance in the contact. Lawful contact could include a witness or crime victim. The new law gives the law enforcement officer discretion to disengage from the immigration requirement if it would interfere with, hinder, obstruct, or fetter an investigation.

Racial profiling is illegal. Biased policing is illegal. Skin color or ethnicity is not indicia of criminality. Complaints of such conduct describe a bad cop not a bad law. When in doubt about the contents of the new law - read it.





# What Have You Done For Me Lately? 2010 Remix

By Franklin R. Marino  
PLEA Trustee

The original version of “What Have You Done For Me Lately?” a popular hit by R&B artist/megastar Janet Jackson, was a major request in the late 1980s when I was spinning tunes at private parties as a mobile deejay. For those of you not familiar with the song, it was about a relationship gone bad and Miss Jackson repeatedly questioned her other half about not holding up his end of the deal.

As with many of the dance songs I have in my collection of 12 inch vinyl records (those things that predated the now nearly obsolete musical compact disc) there were often re-released versions and/or re-mixes that came out a year or two after the original. While the words and basic structure of the song were the same, the pitch may have increased by a few beats, making it faster, or the whole song was re-engineered, causing it to sound completely different from the original version.

To borrow a quote from PLEA Chairman of the Board David Dager, “as a union board member, you have to have thick skin.” I do, however, this past March, while PLEA was in most likely the biggest fight of our thirty five year history, trying to save officers’ jobs, while protecting wages and benefits, the re-mixed version of Janet Jackson’s 1985 hit came from the mouth of a colleague when I walked into a precinct work area to use a computer. This version’s lyrics were “What has PLEA done for me lately? As far as I’m concerned they can kiss my ass.” I didn’t take it personally but I was slightly pissed off based on timing alone and the fact that PLEA had just saved the jobs of other officers sitting in the same work area! Ironically, the colleague was a non-member, one who I am sure enjoys the benefits of what PLEA has accomplished over the years, yet doesn’t have to pay monthly dues. Where I come from, non-union members are usually referred to as a medical term used to describe a crust of hardened blood and serum over a wound.

## *What has PLEA done for you lately?*

1. A 13.7% wage increase with the contract that went into effect in July 2008. Granted we now have to give up 1% of those wages, but it was the largest pay raise in nearly twenty years and I remember getting raises of 1.5% in the fifteen years I’ve been on.
2. Chevy Tahoes. PLEA worked hard to have fuel bladders installed in our Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors after Jason Schecterle was burned. Ironically, the bladders created unintended costs related to downtime and repairs, PLEA convinced the Vehicle Committee to research the feasibility of using the Chevy Tahoe as a replacement patrol vehicle. I, along with Bryan Hanania from the Canine Unit spec’ed out and designed our first twelve Tahoes. PLEA Reps and members assigned to Patrol evaluated them and feedback was compiled in a survey. Data from

the survey was later used to convince our City Council to fund additional money to purchase more Tahoes in 2007 and 2008. As far as the Impala, although many people dislike them, they are a necessary evil due to the sheer costs of marked patrol vehicles and budget limitations.

3. Ask Carl Ramirez about what PLEA did to help him get his job back after being terminated for alleged steroid use.
4. CEP. For anyone in the program, it translates to extra income based on efforts and time put into obtaining job related education, training, and attaining certain specialty skills. The City has repeatedly tried to eliminate this benefit, but PLEA has continued to fight for it, since it awards those who choose to make themselves better educated and trained officers.
5. Overtime. When I was in the civilian sector working as a machinist in 1982, I spent a month working 12 hour shifts, five days a week plus another four hours on Saturdays to finish a project for a customer. However, I only received overtime for the time above my regular forty hours workweek. PLEA negotiated that we get overtime for any time above a regular eight or ten hour shift.
6. Court Standby. Two hours for dockets prior to noon and an additional hour for anything after that, or two hours for an afternoon docket. Plus, if you get called out, you are eligible for overtime
7. Court overtime. We receive a minimum of three hours whether we are there for fifteen minutes or the full three hours on an “N” day, or at a time other than our regular scheduled shift. Many other agencies only get the time they put in or a two hour minimum.
8. Free Parking at the 305 Garage. Not only do you get your Court Standby and Court Overtime, but you don’t have to pay to park in the garage while you’re getting paid your Court Overtime.
9. Uniform allowance and vest allowance. Our vest allowance was increased to eight hundred dollars during the last contract to reflect current market rates for better quality body armor. Many agencies don’t have either and their officers pay out of their pocket for these items. Many of these same agencies don’t supply their officers with a duty weapon, gun belt, holster, magazine case, handcuffs, etc and the costs are borne by the officer for these items as well.
10. Consistent work schedules including days off such as our current four ten hour workdays followed by three days off as long as you wish to remain on a particular squad, unless you are on probation. I have buddies working for an agency in New Jersey who would kill for this schedule. They work four on, four off, and never have the same days off. Closer to home, Mesa PD changes their Patrol schedules every year and officers have to do an annual re-bid. Better yet, try working for an agency where you work four months of day shift, followed by four months of second shift, then four months of third shift, before you start the cycle all over again!

How quickly people forget that these are just a few of the benefits and perks that PLEA has negotiated for Unit 4 members over the years and we will continue to work to get what's best. Granted, we can't please everyone, but the majority of our members are satisfied with what PLEA is doing for them. Unfortunately, non members will continue to ride the coattails of dues paying members and reap some of the benefits. But, wait until you are under the gun for alleged misconduct or involved in a critical incident and have to shell out hundreds or thousands of dollars in attorney's fees to defend yourself. Then you may find yourself singing a different tune...Instead of "What Have You Done for Me Lately?" "Run to You" or "I Guess That's Why They Call it the Blues" come to mind.



**City of Phoenix**  
POLICE DEPARTMENT

May 5, 2010

Phoenix Law Enforcement Association  
1102 W. Adams  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Members of the PLEA Board of Directors:

Thank you for your contribution to National Public Safety Telecommunicator Week.

Police Dispatchers and 9-1-1 Operators serve as the first point of contact when our community needs help. Because of your contribution we were able to conduct several activities during the week to recognize their efforts. The excellent work of these individuals many times goes unnoticed as most of their efforts are "behind the scenes." This time set aside to recognize their efforts is a small but important opportunity for our community to learn about and appreciate their fine work.

Thanks again for your generosity and your appreciation of our Operators.

Sincerely,

JACK F. HARRIS  
Police Chief

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. F. Harris", is written over the typed name and title.

KIM R. HUMPRHEY  
Commander  
Communications Bureau

JS\comm\G\STOKES\telecomappreciationletter.doc

# ...notified, Patrol Took Dispo.

*By Franklin R. Marino  
Central City Precinct*

Anyone on the Department who wears a uniform and starts their shift in a room where the squad sits behind a group of tables, while their sergeant sits behind another one facing them and reads excerpts from a four to six inch thick binder, knows that most of the station entries in that binder regarding what many lay people and even most police officers consider serious crimes, like sexual assault, aggravated assault, child abuse, and child molestation, usually end with the following three words: "Patrol Took Dispo." With over fifteen years of Patrol experience, including five and a half as an FTO, I consider myself to be an experienced, veteran officer. In 1997, I, along with several squad mates, completed "Investigator Training" aka "Detective Class," through Rio Salado Community College. Many people from that class and others I have worked with in Patrol have moved on to investigative details, including those I consider to be the cream of the crop, Homicide, Vehicular Crimes, and Child Crimes. However, I have not found a reason to leave Patrol. Call me crazy, but I love riding a beat and at this point in my career, I have no desire to trade in a Tahoe on the street for a desk in an office.

Prior to our budget crisis, over the course of the past several years, while specialty and some investigative details continued to expand, Patrol, the supposed "Backbone of the Department" continued and still does more with less, remaining on the proverbial short end of the stick in regards to more responsibilities with less resources.

Policy states that we have to tape record all domestic violence interviews, and we get 'nasty grams' from detectives and supervisors if we don't, but has anyone ever been allowed to use these tapes as evidence in a misdemeanor case in City court? In all the years that have passed since this policy was enacted, I have yet to see one be entered.

You used to be able to go to the information channel for an Evidence Technician to respond to your scene for photographs of a domestic violence victim. Current Department policy states primary responsibility for these photographs rests with the Laboratory Services Bureau and photographs of victims of child abuse should be taken by an Evidence Technician as well. I can't remember the last time I saw a tech photograph a victim or scene other than when an investigative detail responded for disposition. Instead of hiring more Evidence Technicians, the Department buys digital cameras for patrol, adding another task to our list.

As long as I've been here, we have always processed scenes for latent prints with black powder. Anyone who has ever taken a burglary or recovered a stolen vehicle has entered a variation of "I processed the scene for latent prints..." into their reports. This continues to be the case, but now, in the "CSI Age," biological evidence collection, AKA "DNA certified officers" are being utilized. These officers are trained to process scenes where fingerprints can't be obtained, but a suspect may have left body fluids, such as blood and/or sweat at the scene. Initially developed for burglaries, the program is being applied for stolen vehicle investigations, but adds yet another responsibility to our list.

I, like many of you have been on my share of shootings and stabblings over the years where after waiting around for what seems like an eternity, a supervisor finally says, "Patrol will be taking disposition." I've become quite adept at photographing crime scenes for myself, my squad mates and other officers in the precinct. Due to a lack of cameras on the street, this means responding to other precincts.

Along with taking photos comes processing and impounding evidence, interviewing witnesses/victims, and maybe a crime scene diagram or two. For me and most of us who are in Patrol, the highlight of a case like this is arresting the bad guy and many of us routinely obtain full confessions from the subsequent interviews before we get to book them in jail.

Patrol officers routinely do photo lineups and follow up investigations of crimes they initially responded to. Many times these result in arrests of a suspect who would have been outstanding for some time. A while back, I booked a pimp on several major felony charges after doing a photo lineup with his juvenile victim. Shortly after that I made a "page two" arrest of an aggravated robbery suspect the day after I initially booked him on warrants and criminal traffic charges, not knowing he was a suspect in the robbery. I'd like to believe that more patrol officers are doing photo lineups because it's tough for detectives to get out from under caseloads to hit the streets to try and locate suspects.

While search warrants are something traditionally reserved for use by detectives, I know of patrol supervisors who have not only showed their squads how to write them, but routinely allow officers to write and execute them, obtaining excellent results in recovering evidence of serious felony crimes, translating to making solid cases leading to successful prosecution.

I have been regularly called on and have always volunteered to take civilian observers for ride-alongs. Many have been prospective police recruits, including out of state officers considering lateral transfers. Most of them are amazed at the amount of investigative work that Patrol does. In many agencies across the country, patrol officers do a cursory investigation to get the basics, but if the call involves an arrest or interview, detectives respond and Patrol goes 10-8. Imagine if we could do that here!

I often tell my COs that Phoenix Police Officers in a first responder role do more investigative work than most detectives in many agencies across the USA. This obviously has its benefits as it builds and hones investigative skills and provides excellent hands on experience for anyone planning on becoming a detective. However, the downside is that Patrol resources, which traditionally have been stretched thin, suffer because of the time that units are tied up at scenes, either doing the actual investigation or waiting to see if detectives are coming out to assume disposition.

If Phoenix truly wants to become the "Safest Major City" then I believe the Phoenix Police Department needs to seriously re-evaluate its current practice of having Patrol conduct as much investigative work as it does. I know that the creation of additional Night Detective squads was done in an effort to reduce Patrol's workload, but the entire investigative process might need to be re-evaluated and revamped.

There is a current proposal to allow officers to do their own case management for certain crimes. I think this is a great idea and not to offend any detectives, but who knows suspects, their hang-outs and habits better than a competent beat officer? This would also give Patrol officers an incentive to truly take accountability for their beats. With some training, I'm sure FCBA cases could be submitted by Patrol officers and cases with potential solvability and/ or follow-up could be handled by these officers as well. However, until then, we'll continue with "...notified, Patrol took dispo."

# PICTURE THIS...



By Bill Galus  
PLEA Trustee

We have all seen the photograph on the news with a story that begins something like this, “Phoenix Police Officer X is under investigation for.....”. In the background, above the news reporters shoulder, is a photograph of the accused officer in question. This photograph is sometimes not the most flattering, usually one from a few years back or maybe the photograph from the precinct photo board.

Why do you sometimes see a photograph of the officer in question and other times not? How does the department decide which officers’ photographs are released to the media and which ones aren’t? The answer in most cases is simply whether or not the officer in question has his or her MVD information redacted.

Here’s how it works: When a request from an individual or entity (i.e. the media) for an officer’s photograph is received by the department, the department first checks to determine if the officer has their MVD information redacted. If the officer does, then the department is mandated by state law not to release their photograph; this includes their commission card picture or precinct photograph.

Now keep in mind, there are exceptions in regards to the release of an officer’s photograph. For instance, if an officer has been charged with a crime, then the department can release their photograph.

So redacting your MVD information helps in two ways. Not only will MVD not release your photograph (state law also mandates MVD not to release this information) but the department is also mandated under state law to not release your photograph. For a complete understanding of this mandate, A.R.S. 39-123 is the state statute that governs the release of officers’ photographs.

So if you don’t want your photograph displayed on the evening news, then redact your MVD records. If you need some direction about how to get your MVD records redacted, you may contact me at the PLEA office. If you have additional questions or require further assistance with the redaction process, feel free to contact our department’s liaison for the Records Redaction Program, Sgt. Sandra Raby at 495-7805

## LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL NAPIER, P.C.

**MICHAEL NAPIER** has been representing Phoenix officers for over 32 years. Mr. Napier is one of the most experienced labor and personal injury attorneys in Arizona. Mr. Napier has represented hundreds of officers before administrative bodies throughout Arizona, and has assisted critically injured officers and the survivors of the officers in obtaining compensation for their injuries and losses.

**JANET FELTZ** was admitted to practice in Arizona in 1985. Prior to joining the firm in 2005, she served as an administrative hearing officer for twenty years in disciplinary and other employment matters on behalf of merit boards and commissions throughout the State. She also served as an administrative law judge for the Arizona Department of Economic Security from 2001 – 2005.

**ANTHONY COURY** has focused his 9 years of practice primarily on personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits in which he has served as plaintiffs’ counsel. He has experience in cases dealing with dram shop liability, negligence, governmental claims and products liability including service as counsel on the litigation team for Phoenix Police Officer Jason Schechterle.

**KATHRYN BAILLIE** was born and reared in Phoenix, Arizona, completing her undergraduate degree at Arizona State University. She served as a J.A. for the Third Circuit Court and then worked as a Public Defender in the Commonwealth of Kentucky before joining the Law Office of Michael Napier, P.C. She has worked with Michael Napier on personal injury and wrongful death cases, dram shop liability, negligence, administrative, disciplinary, and other employment matters.

In addition to the full services provided to PLEA members to protect their careers, the Law Offices of Michael Napier P.C. provide the following:

**Personal injury recovery** (on or off duty); experienced representation at a reduced fee;

**Reduced fees** for matters not covered by the PLEA legal plan;

**Free probate** of officer’s estate for line-of-duty death; Free consultations to members on any matter, and **Referrals** to attorneys or specialists for matters not handled by the firm.

2525 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle • Suite 130  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
(602) 248-9107 • [www.napierlawfirm.com](http://www.napierlawfirm.com)

## PHOENIX AREA DISCOUNTS FOR SUMMER

Tickets on sale at PLEA

Castles ‘n Coasters \$15 Adult/Child thru  
9/30/10

Big Surf \$18 Adult/Child thru Labor Day

Wet ‘n’ Wild \$25 Adult/Child thru 9/26/10



**PHOENIX LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION**

1102 WEST ADAMS STREET  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

602.246.7869 • fax 602.246.0226  
www.azplea.com

Return Service Requested

Non-Profit Organization  
United States Postage  
**PAID**  
Phoenix, Arizona  
**PERMIT NO. 787**



# Representation Committee



**Chairperson**  
Dave Kothe

**Vice Chairpersons**  
Jerry Gannon & Ken Crane

### Representatives

Tim Baiardi • Kent Barnes • Ken Barton  
John Buckner • Brent Bundy • Bob Furneaux • Greg Gibbs  
Bret Glidewell • Scott Gomez • Bryan Hanania  
Gary Hotchkiss • Steve Huddleston • Barry Jacobs  
Michael London • John McTernan • Terry Mills  
Anthony Navas • Dave Sampson  
Scott Sayban • Clark Schwartzkopf • Rick Simonick  
Frank Smith • Kevin Smith • Jason Smith • Stu Sterling  
Rusty Stuart • Tom Tardy • Mike Walsh • James Ward

#### *If You Have A Grievance*

**FIRST:** Attempt to resolve the matter informally with your supervisor.

**SECOND:** If you cannot resolve this with your supervisor, contact one of the representatives above.

**REMEMBER:** There are time limits to initiate a written grievance.

#### *If You Are Being Investigated*

**RECORD:** All interviews once you have been given an NOI.

**COPY:** All memos or paperwork related to the investigation.

**TRUTHFULLY:** Answer all questions related to the investigation.

If you are called by Professional Standards Bureau or any police supervisor regarding an investigatory interview or interrogation, you may have PLEA representation during that interview.

Call for representation as soon as possible. For your convenience, a PLEA board member and representative are available 24/7.

### The Board Of Trustees

David Dager ..... Chairman of the Board  
Mark Spencer ..... President  
Dave Kothe ..... Vice President  
Joe Clure ..... Treasurer  
Ken Crane ..... Secretary  
Will Buividas ..... Trustee/Chief Negotiator  
Mark Enegren ..... Trustee/Representation  
Bill Galus ..... Trustee/Representation  
Jerry Gannon ..... Trustee/Representation  
Frank Marino ..... Trustee/Representation  
Terry Yahweh ..... Trustee/Representation

### PLEA Legal Resources

Michael Napier ..... Legal Counsel  
Janet Feltz ..... Legal Counsel  
Anthony Coury ..... Legal Counsel  
Kathryn Baillie ..... Legal Counsel  
James Abdo ..... Legal Counsel

(602) 248-9107

[www.napierlawfirm.com](http://www.napierlawfirm.com)

### Legislative Liaisons

Levi Bolton ..... Lobbyist  
Williams & Associates ..... Lobbyist

### The PLEA Office Staff

Arlene Venturini ..... Office Manager  
Leigh Ann Bennett ..... Accounts Manager  
JoAnn Gothard ..... Membership Services  
Debbie Webster ..... Membership Services  
Melissa Solimeno ..... Membership Services

### The RECAP Staff

Ken Crane ..... Editor  
Bill Steele ..... Publisher